

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 15-1317-PA (SP)	Date	July 11, 2017
Title	RICKY HOWARD v. PAULETTE FINANDER, et al.		

Present: The Honorable	Sheri Pym, United States Magistrate Judge
------------------------	---

Kimberly I. Carter

None

None

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

None Present

None Present

**Proceedings: (In Chambers) Order to Show Cause Why Defendants Marcela and Fitter Should Not Be Dismissed for Plaintiff's Failure to Prosecute**

On May 19, 2017, the court issued two orders that provided for service of the operative Second Amended Complaint on defendants Wilder Marcela and Junaid Fitter. One order, the Order Directing Service of Process by the United States Marshal ("Service Order") (docket no. 45), directed service on defendants Marcela and Fitter. The second order, the Order Re: Service of Process by United States Marshal ("Order Re: Service") (docket no. 46), set forth certain steps that needed to be taken to allow the U.S. Marshal to accomplish such service.

In particular, in the Order Re: Service, the court ordered plaintiff to complete a separate USM-285 form for each defendant, and then send the completed forms to the clerk of court. The clerk sent plaintiff copies of blank USM-285 forms with the Order Re: Service, and the Order Re: Service gave plaintiff specific instructions as to how to complete the forms. The Order Re: Service set a deadline of June 16, 2017 for plaintiff to return to the clerk the completed USM-285 forms, and to complete and file the Notice of Submission form attached to the Order Re: Service. The court explicitly cautioned: *"If plaintiff does not submit the completed USM-285 forms and file the Notice of Submission by **June 16, 2017**, this action will be subject to dismissal without prejudice for plaintiff's failure to comply with the court's order and/or plaintiff's failure to prosecute."*

More than three weeks have passed since the June 16, 2017 deadline, and plaintiff has not returned USM-285 forms for defendants Marcela and Fitter, nor has plaintiff filed the Notice of Submission. It therefore appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with the court's Order Re: Service. Plaintiff's failure to comply with the court's Order Re:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 15-1317-PA (SP)	Date	July 11, 2017
Title	RICKY HOWARD v. PAULETTE FINANDER, et al.		

Service renders this action subject to dismissal for failure to comply with a court order and failure to prosecute. Moreover, the action cannot proceed against defendants Marcela and Fitter if plaintiff does not take the steps required to serve them with the Second Amended Complaint.

Accordingly, within **fourteen (14)** days of the date of this Order, that is, by **July 25, 2017**, plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE**, in writing, why defendants Marcela and Fitter should not be dismissed from this case for plaintiff's failure to prosecute them and comply with a court order. Plaintiff may discharge this Order to Show Cause by returning completed USM-285 forms for defendants Marcela and Fitter and filing the Notice of Submission by July 25, 2017. Plaintiff is cautioned that his failure to timely file a response to this Order to Show Cause will be deemed by the court as consent to the dismissal of these defendants without prejudice.